

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9 and 14-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9 and 14-17 are amended. Claim 6 is cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 14 and 17 are independent claims.

Telephone Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting a telephone interview to Applicants' representative, Scott Elchert, on August 16, 2007. The claim amendments shown in the preceding section of this amendment were briefly discussed during the interview, and the Examiner agreed that the claim amendments overcome the current rejections. However, the Examiner indicated that the claim amendments raised new issues requiring further search and/or consideration. Therefore, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is submitted concurrently with this amendment so the amendment is entered on the record.

Drawings

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the drawings filed February 5, 2007 have been accepted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

Information Disclosure Statement and Certified Priority Document

An Information Disclosure Statement was filed July 31, 2007, and Applicants request the Examiner acknowledge consideration of the references included in the Information Disclosure Statement in the next communication received from the USPTO. Applicants note

a certified copy of the priority document was also filed on July 31, 2007 and thus, Applicants also request the Examiner acknowledge receipt of the priority document.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 15 are objected to for various informalities. The Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims shown in the preceding section of this amendment are sufficient to address and overcome each of the identified informalities.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objections to claims 1, 3, 5 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 14-16:

Claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Ueda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,102, herein Ueda). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Initially, Applicants note that the high, density computer-readable medium claimed in amended claim 1 includes “at least one access block including physical address data having 24 columns and 6 rows, and user control data having 24 columns and 24 rows.” Support for this feature is illustrated in FIG. 3 showing a BD-ROM access block and page 5 of the specification describing FIG. 3. Amended independent claims 7, 14 and 17 recite somewhat similar features.

Ueda describes a method and apparatus relating to use of a DVD. FIG. 1 of Ueda illustrates a data structure of the DVD. As evidenced by FIG. 1, the DVD described in Ueda does not include “at least one access block including physical address data having 24

columns and 6 rows, and user control data having 24 columns and 24 rows,” as recited in amended claim 1 or the similar features recited in independent claim 14.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1 and 14, as well as 3, 5-6 and 14-16 depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 7-9:

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by a different embodiment of Ueda. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the same arguments provided above distinguishing amended independent claim 1 over Ueda also distinguish amended independent claim 7 over Ueda.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) also be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Ueda in view of Reed (U.S. Publication No. 2002/011992, herein Reed). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as detailed below.

Applicants review of Reed indicates that Reed fails to cure the deficiencies of Ueda discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 is allowable over the combination of Ueda and Reed for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is patentable over Ueda since claim 4 depends from claim 1. Further, independent claim 17 is allowable over the combination of Ueda and Reed at least because of the features of independent claim 17 that are similar to independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 4 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of the pending claims of this application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$120 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: Scott Elchert 55,149
Terry L. Clark, Reg. No. 32,644

Scott A. Elchert, Reg. No. 55,149

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

TLC/SAE/ame